

Interview Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	09/451,666		ITO ET AL.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	BJ Forman		1634	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) BJ Forman. (3)_____.

(2) Gregory Einhorn. (4)_____.

Date of Interview: 16 December 2002.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: all.

Identification of prior art discussed: Wohlstadtler et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,207,369).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.


Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview(if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Einhorn sent a proposed amendment to the examiner by FAX. The proposed amendments were discussed. The examiner stated that the Wohlstadtler reference teaches much of the claims as presented in the proposed amendments. For example, Wohlstadtler teaches spotting with a binding agent and then spotting with a probe (col. 18-22 and col. 75 example 6.2). The examiner stated that Wohlstadtler does not teach spotting a mixture of binding agent and probe and that claims drawn to that embodiment are not encompassed by the teaching of Wohlstadtler. Mr. Einhorn stated that he would contact applicant before responding a filing a formal response. .